DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 279 TM 025 446

AUTHOR Bliss, Leonard B.; And Others
TITLE First Steps in the Development of the "Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio": The Spanish Version of the "Study Behavior Inventory."
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Bilingual Education; Factor Analysis; Factor Structure; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Pilot Projects; Scores; Sex Differences; *Spanish; Study Habits; *Test Construction; Test Items; Test Reliability; *Translation; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio; Mexico; *Study Behavior Inventory

ABSTRACT

The Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio (ICE), a Spanish translation of the Study Behavior Inventory (SBI) was developed and tested using a group of 594 undergraduate students from randomly selected classes at a private comprehensive university in Mexico. Both instruments were designed to assess the study behaviors of students in institutions of higher education. A team of bilingual specialists at the university developed the ICE with the intention of producing a translation that was generic enough to be understood across Spanish speaking nations and cultures. A pilot test with 30 students resulted in a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.84 and agreement scores on items ranging from 63.7% to 100% on administrations that were separated by 7 days. Factor analysis of the scores of the sample of 594 revealed 4 factors that accounted for 89% of the total variance of the scores. Three were virtually identical to those of the SBI, but the fourth consisted of only two items that dealt with student preference for studying alone or with other students. Those two items did not load on any SBI factors. There were no significant gender differences in the mean scores, and Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.76 to 0.85 for the total instrument and first four factors. Correlations between total ICE and the first three factor scores ranged from 0.65 to 0.73. Finally, the correlations between the ICE scores and students' cumulative grade point averages ranged from 0.66 to 0.72. The authors note the limitations of the sample and describe the need for a broader validation sample which is representative of Spanish speaking university students across nations and cultures. The ICE is presented in an appendix. (Contains 2 tables and 20 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LEONARD B. BLISS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ICE 1

ED 399 279

First Steps in the Development of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio: The Spanish Version of the Study Behavior Inventory

Leonard B. Bliss

Appalachian State University

Diana Maria Alejandra Vinay

Universidad de las Américas - Puebla

Frieda Koeninger

Sam Houston State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, New York, April 8, 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM025446

Abstract

The Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio (ICE),a Spanish translation of the Study Behavior Inventory (SBI), was developed and tested using a group of 594 undergraduate students from randomly selected classes at la Universidad de las Américas - Puebla, a private comprehensive university in the state of Puebla, Mexico. The instrument was designed to assess the study behaviors of students in institutions of higher education. A team of bilingual specialists at la UDLA in the areas of Spanish and English language, psychology, student development, and education developed a translation of the SBI with the purpose of producing a translation which was generic enough to be understood across Spanish speaking nations and cultures. A pilot test of the instrument on a sample of 30 students from a randomly selected class resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha value of .84 and agreement scores on items ranging from 63.7% and 100% on administrations that were separated seven days. Factor analysis of the scores of the sample of 594 students revealed four factors accounting for 89 % of the total variance of the scores. The first three being virtually identical to those obtained during the validation of the Study Behavior Inventory. The fourth consisted of only two items which dealt with students' preferences for studying with other students or studying alone. These two items did not load on any of the three SBI factors. There were no significant differences in the mean scores of the entire ICE or the first three factor scores between men and women students. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from .76 to .85 for the total instrument and the first four factors. Correlations between the ICE total score and the first three factor scores with the scores students received on the la Universidad de las Américas entrance examination ranged from ..65 to .73. Finally, the correlations between the ICE scores and students' cumulative grade point averages ranged from .66 to .72. The authors note the limitations of the sample and describe the need for a broader validation sample which is representative of Spanish speaking university students across nations and cultures.

First Steps in the Development of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio:

The Spanish Version of the Study Behavior Inventory

The Study Behavior Inventory

The Study Behavior Inventory (SBI) is an instrument which measures the study behaviors of college and university students in colleges and universities. It is presently in use at over 200 institutions of higher education in the United States. Since shortly after the instrument was first published, the authors have received requests from professionals using the instrument for a Spanish version of the instrument to use with students who have Spanish as their primary language. This is not surprising considering the scale of immigration into the United States of people from Latin American countries and the efforts on the part of US colleges and universities, augmented by local and state governments as well as the federal government, to integrate immigrants and their children into higher education in this country. The purpose of this study was to develop a Spanish translation of the SBI that was in common enough Spanish so that it could be understood by college and university students from all Spanish speaking countries and to field test it on a group of Mexican university students.

Bliss and Mueller (1987) described the state of research into instruments which measured study skills and study behaviors and the history of these measurements in the United States. In 1941 Wren published the results of the first attempt to measure and describe study behaviors in the US. From this study came the Study Habits Inventory (SHI) which examined reading and note taking strategies used by students as tactics they used in preparing for examinations. At the end of the Second World War, however, emphasis in study skills instruction and measurement shifted to the formal study of reading speed and comprehension with reading experts leading the way in this field of study. Variables other than reading skills were ignored as they were simply considered to be problems of motivation.

This attitude had changed by 1966 when Brown and Holtzman published the Scale of Study Habits and Attitudes which looked beyond simple reading and note taking skills in establishing a measure of what students do when they study. In 1982, Mueller and Gibson combined elements of the Study Habits

Inventory and the Scale of Study habits and Attitudes along with other variables suggested by the growing body of literature on study skills and behaviors to produce the Study Behavior Inventory (SBI) which was tested on a sample of undergraduate students at Northern Illinois University. The results of this study lead to the development of Form C of the SBI which added items dealing with test anxiety and coping behavior. Form C was tested using more than 3,000 college and university students in the Chicago area. The scores obtained were found to correlate highly with subjects' high school and college grade point averages. In addition, subjects who reported the need for assistance in one or more of ten academic skills areas had lower scores on the SBI-C than those who did not report such a need.

From the results of this study Mueller (1984) developed Form D of the Study Behavior Inventory. This form was a significant revision of the instrument in that it expanded the general study attitudes section while decreasing the number of items dealing with reading skills. The high intercorrelation of items allowed Mueller to decrease the number of items measuring specific skills while remaining confident that these skills were being adequately measured. Finally, the three-point rating scales of Form C were changed to four-point scales on Form D since there appeared to be a tendency for subjects to choose the middle response on the three-point scales. An initial trial of the instrument with 1,052 college and university students at seven colleges and universities in the Chicago area (Bliss & Mueller, 1986, 1987, 1993) resulted in high levels of test-retest reliability. Factor analysis using a principal components extraction with a varimax rotation elicited three factors. Factor 1 dealt with feelings of insecurity, low self-esteem, and low level of competitiveness when students confronted academic tasks. Factors 2 and 3 included behaviors related to the appropriate use of time making reference to behaviors related to routine, repeated academic asks such as doing assignments and preparing for classes and those involving more long range planning such as studying for an examination or the preparation of papers and other long term projects. Correlations of the whole instrument and the various factors with ACT and SAT scores converted to z-scores ranged from the high .50's to the middle .60's. Correlations with grade point averages ranged from the middle .60's to the middle .70's.

The instrument was standardized on a US nationally representative sample of over 5,000 college and university students and the same factor structure was observed. The psychometric properties of the instrument were similar to the findings with the sample of 1,052 subjects (Bliss & Mueller, 1987).

Spanish Language Instruments of Study Skills and Habits

The large population of students at US colleges and universities who speak Spanish as their first language resulted in repeated requests from the field for a Spanish version of the Study Behavior Inventory. An opportunity to begin work on such an instrument arose when one of the authors was serving as a visiting professor at the Department of Education Sciences at La Universidad de las Américas in Cholula, Puebla, Mexico.

Brown and Holtzman (1994) describe the Encuesta Sobre Habilidades a self-administered survey of study habits, but the literature on this survey lacks any empirical evidence validity or reliability, nor does it provide norms for norm referenced interpretations of its scores. Numerous studies report using the survey, or an adaptation of it (e.g. Losada, 1974), but none of these report evidence of appropriate psychometric properties.

Researchers in various Spanish speaking countries have examined programs which purport to enhance the development of study habits and skills (e.g. Patiño, 1981; Masacare & Valdéz, 1982; Sánchez-Díaz, 1985), but many make the common error of failing to draw a distinction between study skills and study behaviors. Bliss and Mueller (1987) point out that,

> Study skills are the potentials for action while study behaviors are the observed actions, themselves. A student may have all the skills required, that is, he or she may be able to take good notes in class (possession of a study skill) but simply sit in class doodling (the lack of a study behavior).
>
> This distinction is not trivial. Students are often placed in college and university developmental education programs because it is assumed, based on high school grades, admissions tests, and placement tests given at the time that the student enrolls, that they do not exhibit appropriate study behaviors (i.e. they do not take adequate notes; they do not use the library efficiently; they do not use study time well) and a large component of these programs are activities designed to develop skills such as note taking skills, library use strategies, and time management ability. It is assumed that students do not exhibit *study behaviors* because they do not possess the appropriate *study skills*. This assumption may often be unjustified. (p. 16)

Others fail to use validated instruments or fail to establish any connection between study skills and/or habits and educational outcomes (Muñoz, 1993). Martinez-Guerro and Sánchez-Sosa (1993) studied the properties of an instrument called the Cuestionario de Actividades de Estudio in an attempt to validate a study behavior instrument, but reported that the levels of predictive validity on measures of academic achievement were too low to make the instrument useable. The lack of a validated instrument in the Spanish language for the measurement of study behaviors established the need for the development and validation of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio, the Spanish language version of the Study Behavior Inventory.

Method

Subjects

One of the authors served as a visiting professor as part of a faculty exchange at La Universidad de Las Américas in Cholula, Puebla, México during the 1994-95 academic year. This provided access to a group of academic experts in the Spanish and English languages who could work on an appropriately generic Spanish translation of the Study Behavior Inventory and a convenient sample of Spanish speaking students with whom to initially validate the translation. La Universidad de las Américas had an enrollment of 5,854 undergraduates during the Spring 1995 semester. Of these, 51% were men and 49% were women. Most are traditionally aged students. The median age for undergraduates was 21 years. Approximately 95% of these come from homes within the Republic of Mexico with 36% listing permanent address in the State of Puebla. The rest are from primarily urban areas with the Federal District (Mexico City) heading the list. Most students attend on a full-time basis, typically taking five courses per semester. La UDLA is a private university with a high tuition. Students typically come from upper middle to upper class families with incomes typically around ten times the Mexican minimum wage. Clearly, students attending La UDLA are not representative of the Mexican university student population.

Thirty-four classes were randomly selected from the list of 1,046 undergraduate academic classes given at la Universidad de las Américas during the Spring 1995 semester. Data was collected from 594 students in these classes and these constituted the sample for the study. It consisted of approximately 48% men and 52% women.

Instrumentation

The Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio was derived from the Study Behavior Inventory (Form D). The translation of any document from one language to another is not a simple thing. This is particularly true when the instrument is a psychometric instrument where even subtle variations in wording may have a profound effect on the responses obtain when the instrument is used. Translating into Spanish is particularly tricky since the spread of Spanish throughout the western hemisphere since the 16th century has resulted in wide variations in the language across geographical areas. The goal of the translation portion of this study was to come up with a translation that was generic enough to be understood similarly across Spanish speaking areas. First, two of the authors independently prepared translations of the SBI. Then a team of eight people consisting of a professor of Spanish language, three psychologists, the director of the university's orientation program, a visiting professor expert in educational and psychological measurement, the director of the university's testing program, and a graduate student in the Department of Educational Sciences reviewed the two translations and worked for approximately eight hours to redact the two documents into a single translation. The result was the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio (ICE) (see Appendix), a 46 item instrument to which subjects respond on a four-point scale indicating how often a particular statement might apply to them. Specifically, the response could be *(A) Nunca o rara vez es verdad en mi caso.* [Never or rarely true in my case.]; *(B) A veces es verdad en mi caso.* [Sometimes true in my case.]; *(C) Con frecuencia o generalmente es verdad en mi caso.* [Often or usually true in my case]; or *(D) Siempre o casi siempre es verdad en mi caso.* [Always or almost always true in my case]. Items were stated positively and negatively to avoid response set.

Procedure

Pilot testing. An additional class of students was randomly selected from among the academic undergraduate courses offered at la Universidad de las Américas during the Spring 1995 semester. The 30 students in that class were administered the ICE and administered it again after seven days. On the first administration, a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .84 was obtained for the entire instrument. This represented a satisfactory level of internal consistency reliability. When the responses on the pre- and post-test were compared for each of the 46 items six items had agreement percentages between 63.3% and 73.3% (items 5, 11, 23, 24, 29, 45 and 46). The other items all had agreement percentages of 76.7% or greater. This was considered to be a satisfactory level of test-retest reliability.

Students in this group were also asked to report any difficulty they had in reading and interpreting the items on the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio. None of the items proved difficult for more than one person according to these self reports.

Data collection. The ICE was administered to students in their regular classes by the same investigator in all cases. The investigator gave a brief explanation of the rationale and importance of the study. Students were asked to write their student identification numbers on the optical scanner forms which they used to record their answers, but were assured that their responses would be treated confidentially. They were told that there would be no time limit and that they could turn in their answer sheets whenever they were finished. No student took more than 20 minutes to complete the instrument.

When all subjects were tested, the response sheets were all scanned and a file produced which showed students' responses for each item as well as their grade point averages and la UDLA admission test scores. Admission tests are taken the semester prior to students' first semester of attendance at the university. The latter two variables were obtained from the university's computerized files.

Results

Validity

Factor analysis. A factor analysis using a principal components extraction with a verimax rotation was performed on the ICE responses. The procedures yielded eight factors with eigen values equal or greater than 1.00. Of these, the first four appeared to be significant upon application of scree testing procedures and these three factors accounted for 74% of the total variance of the scores on the instrument. Table 1 shows the distribution of ICE items among the four factors and their loadings. An item was considered to be included in a factor if it had a factor loading of at least .30 on one of the four factors with no loading greater than .25 on any other factor. Three items did not conform to this criterion and were not assigned to any of the factors. These items apparently shared little variance with other items on the inventory.

Table 1

Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio Factor Loadings

Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		No factor
Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item
33	.7131	1	.6014	5	.6741	8	.8711	15
34	.6907	18	.5664	17	.5936	3	-.8619	20
42	.6817	16	.5660	37	.5287			24
32	.6749	7	.5242	23	.4933			
46	.5802	2	.5131	26	.4707			
22	.5614	29	.5081	9	.4193			
39	.5457	31	.4943	11	.4155			
41	.5341	44	.4717	27	.4032			
28	.5241	4	.3891	36	.3824			
35	.5124	12	.3835	30	.3603			
25	.5107	10	.3289	6	.3457			
13	.4587			40	.3319			
19	.4187							
45	.4170							
14	.4091							
21	.3990							
38	.3971							
43	.3394							

This factor structure is virtually the same as reported by Bliss and Mueller (1993) for the Study Behavior Inventory. An exception to this statement is the presence of a fourth factor containing two items. On examination, it was found that both these items (item 8 and item 3) were the only items dealt with students' preferences for studying alone or with other students. Specifically, the items read, "Me gusta estudiar con compañeros [I prefer to study with friends] and "Prefiero esudiar solo que con otros" [I prefer to study alone rather than with others]. Bliss and Mueller found these items to be among those not loading on any factor. The fact that they produce a fourth orthogonal factor on the ICE is probably more consistent with the theoretical base behind the instrument which suggests that behaviors are mediated by attitudes and feelings. These items deal with such attitudes and feelings and it is less suprising that they are highly intercorrelated and contribute significant variability to the total ICE score than it was that they did not behave like this on the SBI. Intuitively, it seems reasonable that responses on these items, which are simply the inverse of each other, should be highly, and negatively, related. The presence of the fourth factor demonstrates this. A partial explanation for the lack of this fourth factor in the English language SBI which was validated on university and college students in the United States, could be found in the fact that Latin American cultures tend to value cooperation and group efforts more than Anglo cultures which are more individualistic and competitive. This idea should certainly be investigated and tested.

Factor 1, a group of 16 items, accounted for 39% of the total variance of the scores on the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio. As in the SBI, these items deal with academic self-perception, and feelings of low self-esteem and insecurity about one's ability to accomplish academic goals. This factor includes such items as, "Tengo que releer el material varias veces. No entiendo el significado de las palabras la primera vez que las leo. [I have to reread material several times; passages do not have much meaning the first time I go over them.]" and "Me pongo nervioso y confundido cuando presento exámenes, y no contesto tan bien como sé que soy capaz de hacerlo. [I get nervous and confused when taking an examination and fail to answer questions to the best of my ability.]" Another of the items loading on this factor is, "Se me dificulta expresarme por escrito y por eso me retraso en la entrega de reportes, ensayos, examines y otros trabajos.

[Difficulty in expressing myself in writing slows me down on reports, themes, examinations, and other work to be turned in.]"

Factors 2 and 3 both included items which dealt with the use of time. What distinguished these two sets of behaviors from each other was their level of routineness and the specificity of the goal toward which the preparation was being done. Factor 2, which included 12 items and accounted for 25% of the total variance of the inventory scores, contained items which assessed behaviors having to do with preparation for routine, day-to-day academic tasks. Such tasks included reviewing class notes in preparation for the next class meeting, doing assigned readings between class meetings, and completing homework assignments. ICE items in this factor include, "Llevo al día mis tareas realizándolas regularmente. [I keep my assignments up-to-date by doing my work regularly from day to day.]"; "Después de la clase, repaso mis apuntes, revisando las partes en las que tengo dudas. [After a class lecture, I go back and recite to myself the materials in my notes — rechecking points I find doubtful.]"; and "Antes de asistir a clase, me preparo leyendo o estudiando el material correspondiente. [Before attending class, I prepare by reading or studying the assignment.]"

Factor 3 (11 items accounting for 14% of the variance) contained items which described study behaviors involved in planning and carrying out specific, long-range academic tasks such as writing papers and studying for examinations. These activities involved planning over long periods of time and did not occur on a regular, day-to-day basis. They included, "Cuando tengo dudas relacionadas con presentación correcta de un reporte escrito, uso un modelo estándard o guía. [When in doubt about the proper form for a written report, I refer to an approved model to provide a guide to follow.]"; and "Cuando me preparo para un examen, estudio siguiendo algún orden lógico (de importancia, histórico, de presentación en clase o del libro de texto, etc.). [When preparing for an examination, I learn facts in some logical order of importance, order of presentation in class or textbook, order of time in history, etc.]"

Finally, Factor 4, accounting for 11% of the total variance of the scores on the inventory, contained two items dealing with student preferences for studying alone or with other people.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Relationships with other variables. There were no significant differences between the scores of men and women on the total score of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio or on any of the first three factors. Factor 4 was not considered in this analysis nor in subsequent analysis since it only contained two items. Table 2 shows the results of this t-test.

Table 2

ICE Total and Factor Scores Broken Down by Sex

	Men (n=266)		Women (n=285)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Factor 1	3.7	.49	3.1	.51	.02	549	.981
Factor 2	2.7	.46	2.7	.51	-.11	549	.909
Factor 3	3.1	.44	3.1	.45	1.20	549	.229
Total score	3.0	.32	3.0	.35	.52	549	.601

Pearson's correlations between students' total score on the Universidad de las Américas entrance examination score for each of the first three factors of the ICE and the total ICE score were .71, .67, .65, and .73, respectively. The correlations between students' cumulative grade point averages and the first three factors and total score on the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio were .72, .68, .66, and .72, respectively.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha for the first three factors of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio and for the total ICE score were .85, .80, .76, and .85, respectively. These were considered adequately high levels of internal consistency.

Conclusions and Discussion

The Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio appears to produce valid and reliable scores when used with this limited population of Mexican students. In addition, it seems to produce scores and a factor structure similar to those of the English language Study Behavior Inventory which are consistent with the theoretical base underlying the SBI.

The Factor Structure

As early as 1980, Friedlander noted that students who are most at risk academically very often fail to take part in programs designed to assist them, even when their institutions offer high quality, demonstrably effective programs. This phenomenon may be explained by the work of the "phenomenologist" or "humanist" psychologists (Combs & Snygg, 1959; Patterson, 1973). These workers suggest that human behavior is determined, not necessarily by objective reality, but what people perceive reality to be. "What is perceived is not what exists, but what one believes exits, . . . what we have learned to perceive as a result of our past opportunities and experiences" (Combs & Snygg, 1959, pp. 84-85). It follows that students who perceive themselves as incompetent and helpless will be less likely to seek help since they think of themselves as incapable of being helped. Students who have a personal history of academic failure may very well have determined that it is pointless for them to even try to succeed academically. Thus, the idea that academic self concept may be a determiner of study behaviors is consistent with the extraction of Factor I in both the ICE and the SBI.

Academic success has been found to be strongly related to the ability to manage time (Rothblum, 1985; Rothblum, Solomon & Murakami, 1986). Rothblum noted that students scoring higher on measures of efficient use of time tended to work in a more organized and productive manner as deadlines approached than did students who scored lower on these measures. The more effective time users also tended to receive higher grades on material that was handed in to instructors. Further, Grecco (1984/1985) found that students who made more efficient use of time were more likely to make positive statements about themselves than students who made less efficient use of time, suggesting that a relationship exists between time management behavior and self esteem. In general, Grecco found that nonprocrastinators were more likely to display adaptive academic behaviors than were procrastinators.

Relationships With Other Variables

The moderately strong correlations obtained between the total Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio score and the first three factor scores and measures of academic achievement (the Universidad de las

Américas entrance examination and student cumulative grade point average) are consistent with the findings of Bliss and Mueller (1993) on the Study Behavior Inventory and with the theoretical relationship between study behaviors and academic achievement. While the simple presence of an observed relationship between study behaviors and academic success in no way establishes a causal relationship between these variables, it does suggest some fertile ground for future experimental studies.

Limitations of These Findings

As suggested in the title of this paper, this study was merely a first step in the development of the Inventario de Comportamiento de Estudio. First, we are concerned about the low factor loadings of item 43 on Factor 1, item 10 on Factor 2, and items 6 and 40 on Factor 3. While these are above the criterion of .30 originally set for placing items in specific factors, the reasons for these low loadings need to be investigated.

Of greater concern, however, is the limitation of the nonrepresentativeness of the sample used in this study. The students at la Universidad de las Américas come almost exclusively from upper middle class and upper class Mexican families and do not even constitute a representative sample of Mexican university students, much less a representative sample of all Spanish speaking students. In addition, the translation team consisted totally of Mexican and Spanish speaking academics from the United States of America. The cultural and linguistic differences among different Spanish speaking populations is widely known and a thorough validation of this instrument will require samples of students from different socioeconomic and national groups. This effort is currently in progress. With these limitations in mind, however, we believe that this research presents a set of promising first steps in the validation of a Spanish language instrument for the measurement of study behaviors.

References

Bliss, L.B,. & Mueller, R.J. (1986, April). An instrument for the assessment of study behaviors of college students. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 180)

Bliss, L.B., & Mueller, R.J. (1987). Assessing study behaviors of college students: Findings from a new instrument. Journal of Developmental Education, 11(2), 14-18.

Bliss, L.B., & Mueller, R.J. (1993). An instrument for the assessment of study behaviors of college students. Reading Research and Instruction, 32 (4), 46-52.

Brown, W.F., & Holtzman, W.H. (1966). Survey of study habits and attitudes. New York, Psychological Corporation.

Brown, W.F., & Holtzman, W.H. (1994). Guía para la supervivencia del estudiante. Ciudad de México: Trillas.

Combs, A.W., & Snygg, D. (1959). Individual Behavior. New York: Harper & Row.

Friedlander, J. (1980). Are college support programs and services reaching high risk students? Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 23-28.

Grecco, P.R. (1984/1985). A cognitive-behavioral assessment of problematic academic procrastination: Development of a procrastination self-statement inventory (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 640B.

Losada, C. (1974). Estudio sobre la encuesta de Hábitos de Actividades hacia el estudio de Brown y Holtzman. Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Ciudad de México.

Martínez-Guerro, J., & Sánchez-Sosa, J. (1993). Estrategias de aprendizaje: Análisis predictivo de hábitos de estudio en el desempeño académico de alumnos de bachillerato. Revista Mexicana de Psicología, 1(10), 64-73.

Mascare, S., & Valadéz, R. (1982). La influencia del estudio dirigido en la formación de hábitos de estudio y el rendimiento escolar. E&A: Enseñanza & Aprendizaje, 12, 201-220.

Mueller, R.J. (1984). Building an instrument to measure study behaviors and attitudes: A factor analysis of 46 items. DeKalb, IL: University of Northern Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 535)

Mueller, R.J. & Gibson, E.E. (1982). Study Behavior Inventory (Unpublished manuscript). DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University.

Muñoz, L. (1993). Estudio comparativo de algunos factores que inciden en el rendimiento académico en una población de estudiantes de niveles medio superior y superior. Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad Iberoamericana - Santa Fe, Ciudad de México.

Patterson, C.H. (1973). Humanistic education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Patiño, S. (1981). Programa de asesoría académica: Una solución para el estudiante que ha fallado. Revista de Educación e Investigación, 14, 54-59.

Rothblum, E.D. (1985). Behavioral, affective, and cognitive differences between high and low procrastinators as an academic deadline approaches. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 368.

Rothblum, E.D., Solomon, L.J., & Murakami, J. (1986). Affective, cognitive, and behavioral differences between high and low procrastinators. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 387-394.

Sánchez-Díaz, S. (1985). Estudio dirigido y su aplicación en el aula. Revista de Pedagogía, 26, 118-122.

Wren, C.G. (1941). Study-habit inventory (rev. ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Appendix

INVENTARIO DEL COMPORTAMIENTO DE ESTUDIO

Leonard B. Bliss y Diana Vinay

Esta encuesta está diseñada para determinar los hábitos y las habilidades que has desarrollado hasta esta etapa de tus estudios universitarios. Conocer los resultados de este inventario permitirá ayudar a los estudiantes a desarrollar estrategias de estudio más productivas y a los profesores a desempeñar mejor su trabajo.

La información obtenida será estrictamente confidencial, así que, por favor, sé sincero y honesto en tus respuestas.

A continuación se presenta una serie de afirmaciones acerca de hábitos y actitudes que pueden afectar el uso del tiempo de estudio y, en consecuencia, tu buen rendimiento escolar. Por favor, contesta de acuerdo a tus verdaderos hábitos y no de acuerdo a lo que pienses que debes hacer ni a lo que hacen los demás.

Cómo responder la encuesta:

La encuesta consta de 46 afirmaciones numeradas. Lee cuidadosamente cada una antes de marcar una de las cuatro opciones en la hoja especial de respuestas. No olvides utilizar un lápiz No. 2.

Por favor contesta todas las preguntas, recuerda que esta encuesta se refiere a tus hábitos y actitudes de estudio actuales. Marca cada opción de acuerdo a la siguiente clave:

1. Nunca o rara vez es verdad en mi caso.
2. A veces es verdad en mi caso
3. Con frecuencia o generalmente es verdad en mi caso.
4. Siempre o casi siempre es verdad en mi caso.

I. ACTITUDES Y CONDUCTAS GENERALES DE ESTUDIO

1. Distribuyo mal mi tiempo; me paso demasiado tiempo en ciertas actividades e insuficiente en otras.
2. Se me hace difícil esforzarme para terminar mis trabajos en un determinado tiempo; los dejo incompletos, deficientes o no los entrego a tiempo.
3. Me gusta estudiar con compañeros.

4. Termino mis tareas a tiempo
5. Relaciono y uso lo que aprendo en un curso con lo que aprendo en otros.
6. Copio los diagramas, dibujos, tablas y otras ilustraciones que el profesor pone en el pizarrón.
7. Llevo al día mis tareas realizándolas regularmente.
8. Prefiero estudiar solo que con otros.
9. Antes de empezar a estudiar, organizo mi trabajo para aprovechar mejor el tiempo.
10. Cuando se me dificulta alguna tarea, hablo con el profesor.
11. Me aseguro de entender claramente lo que el profesor espera de mí antes de empezar a preparar trabajos, ensayos, reportes, etc.
12. Cuando por alguna causa inevitable me atraso en el trabajo escolar, repongo las tareas pasadas sin que el profesor me las pida.
13. Se me dificulta expresarme por escrito y por eso me retraso en la entrega de reportes, ensayos, exámenes y otros trabajos.
14. Recibo críticas de mis profesores porque mis trabajos escritos están mal organizados y redactados.
15. Ignoro las correcciones anotadas por el profesor en los exámenes, reportes y tareas.
16. Estudio en forma improvisada, sin planeación, impulsado más por las exigencias de las sesiones de clases más próximas.
17. Me esfuerzo por aprender más allá de la memorización.
18. Dejo la redacción de ensayos, reportes y trabajos hasta el último momento.
19. Veo demasiada televisión y eso interfiere en mis estudios.
20. El tiempo que tengo que dedicar a mi empleo afecta mis estudios considerando los cursos que llevo.
21. Los problemas con mi familia afectan mi habilidad para concentrarme en los estudios.

II. TECNICAS DE LECTURA, REDACCION Y TOMA DE APUNTES.

22. Tengo que releer el material varias veces. No entiendo el significado de las palabras la primera vez que las leo.
23. Me esfuerzo por resumir, clasificar y sistematizar los datos aprendidos, asociándolos con el material aprendido previamente.
24. Cuando leo algún material, no me fijo en las figuras, gráficas, tablas y otras ilustraciones.
25. Después de leer varias páginas de algún material, no puedo recordar lo que acabo de leer.
26. Cuando tengo dudas relacionadas con la presentación correcta de un reporte escrito, uso un modelo estándard como guía.
27. Cuando leo una parte extensa de un libro de texto, me detengo de vez en cuando para repasar mentalmente los puntos principales que están expuestos.
28. Cuando tomo apuntes en clase, me cuesta trabajo identificar los puntos principales; no tomo en cuenta información que después resulta ser importante.
29. Después de la clase, repaso mis apuntes, revisando las partes en las que tengo dudas.
30. Organizo mis apuntes por materia y en un orden lógico.
31. Antes de asistir a clase, me preparo leyendo o estudiando el material correspondiente.

III. CONDUCTAS ANTE LOS EXAMENES

32. Me pongo nervioso y confundido cuando presento exámenes, y no contesto tan bien como sé que soy capaz de hacerlo.
33. Salgo mal en los exámenes porque se me dificulta pensar con claridad y planear mi trabajo al presentarlos.
34. Se me dificulta identificar los puntos importantes de las lecturas, los cuales después vienen en los exámenes.
35. Pierdo puntos en los exámenes de falso-verdadero y de opción múltiple porque cambio mi respuesta original, para descubrir después que era la correcta.
36. Planeo mentalmente las respuestas a las preguntas abiertas o de ensayo antes de empezar a escribir.

37. Cuando me preparo para un examen, estudio siguiendo algún orden lógico (de importancia, histórico, de presentación de la clase o del libro de texto, etc.).
38. Al contestar preguntas en los exámenes, descuido la ortografía y la redacción.
39. Aunque trabajo hasta el último minuto, no alcanzo a terminar mis exámenes en el tiempo proporcionado.
40. Si me queda tiempo, reviso mis respuestas antes de entregar el examen.
41. Cuando me regresan el examen, me doy cuenta que mi califican bajó por errores debidos al descuido.
42. Durante el examen olvido nombres, fechas, fórmulas y otros detalles que realmente sé.
43. Creo que las calificaciones se basan en la habilidad del estudiante para memorizar datos y no para razonar con lógica.
44. Estudio más para el examen final que durante todo el curso.

45. Podría contestar mejor los exámenes si pudiera presentarlos solo y/o sin límite de tiempo.
46. Mi preocupación acerca de qué tan bien contestaré los exámenes interfiere con mi preparación y desempeño.